

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The Stadium Center Phase III project (project) is a proposal by Kitchell Development Company to develop a 16-acre site, located in the southwestern portion of the City of Manteca, with a variety of commercial uses. The project would be the third phase of the developing “Stadium Center” shopping center, and would include large retail, restaurant, and other retail uses. The environmental analysis in this Draft EIR is based on an evaluation of how environmental conditions would be expected to change as a result of implementing the project. Public comments on the Draft EIR will provide important input for the City’s decision on the proposed project. This section summarizes the information contained in the Draft EIR, including a summary of the project description, environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and alternatives.

2.2 THE EIR PROCESS

The City of Manteca, as lead agency or public agency that has the primary authority to approve the project, must certify the EIR as being adequate according to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and consider its environmental information when taking action on the project. Other public agencies with approvals of the project are considered responsible agencies; these agencies would consider the environmental effects of the project based on this Draft EIR. The purpose of an EIR is to identify and assess the environmental impacts that would directly or indirectly occur as a result of the project.

The Draft EIR has been released for public review to receive comments from interested parties on its completeness and adequacy in disclosing the environmental effects of the project. Written responses to significant environmental points raised in comments will be prepared and published. Together, the Draft EIR, comments received on the Draft EIR, and the responses to comments will constitute the Final EIR.

2.3 SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.3.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The project site is located immediately north of State Route 120 (SR 120), approximately 3 miles west of State Route 99 (SR 99), and 3 miles east of Interstate 5 (I-5). The site is generally bounded by SR 120 to the south, residential development to the north and east, fallow land zoned for commercial development to the north, and commercial development to the west. The site is situated at the southeast corner of the intersection of Daniels Street and South Airport Way, east of the Stadium Center I and II shopping centers. Refer to Chapter 3, “Project Description,” for project vicinity and location exhibits.

2.3.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

The City of Manteca, as the lead agency, has developed the following primary objectives to satisfy the requirements of the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15124 (b):

- ▶ design a shopping center that is sensitive to the existing land uses surrounding the project site;
- ▶ develop an attractive and functional shopping environment that provides needed goods and services for a rapidly developing community;
- ▶ provide commercial, retail, and restaurant services to I-5, SR 99, and SR 120 highway users;

- ▶ emphasize high-quality construction and design to ensure the economic viability of the project and continuing value to the community; and
- ▶ provide an important element of a new gateway development area in the southwestern portion of the City of Manteca.

2.3.3 ELEMENTS OF THE PROJECT

The project site is a fallow agricultural field. Irrigation control structures run east and west along the southern border of the site, and an irrigation well and pump are located at the site’s western edge. In the past, the site was used for agricultural row crop production. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the development of a commercial center that would accommodate an approximately 170,589 square-foot Lowe’s Home Improvement Warehouse and approximately 32,000 square feet of retail space in three separate buildings. These project components would be completed in two separate phases. It is anticipated that the proposed project would complement the overall appearance of the nearby Stadium Center I and II shopping centers to the west. The project would be developed in two phases: Phase 1 – Lowe’s Home Improvement Warehouse and Phase 2 – retail buildings.

An approximately 141,436-square-foot Lowe’s Home Improvement Warehouse and an approximately 29,153-square-foot adjoining Lowe’s garden center would be developed on the eastern portion of the 16-acre site. A recessed truck well would be located at the southeast corner of the building, and a product delivery truck lane would be located along the east side of the building. Improvements proposed as part of Phase 2 include the development of approximately 32,000 square feet of retail space in three buildings on the western portion of the project site. The three commercial retail buildings would include a 13,000-square-foot building, a 14,820-square-foot building, and a stand-alone 4,000-square-foot building. It is anticipated that a drive-through “fast food” restaurant would be developed at the 4,000-square-foot site.

The project would require a general plan amendment to change the land use designation for the project site. The proposed land uses are described in greater detail in Section 4.1, “Land Use.” Construction of the proposed project would likely begin in 2008, and construction would proceed in two phases. The Lowe’s Home Improvement Warehouse would be developed in the first phase. The three retail buildings would be developed in the second phase approximately 12 months after completion of the Lowe’s Home Improvement Warehouse.

2.3.4 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

This EIR evaluates the following alternatives to the project:

- ▶ No Project Alternative - No Development
- ▶ No Project Alternative - Current Entitlement
- ▶ Mitigated Design Alternative
- ▶ Off-site Alternative

The No Project Alternative - No Development and the Mitigated Design alternative are environmentally superior to the project. The Off-site Alternative is environmentally similar to the project and would result in comparable impacts, but at an off-site location. The No Project Alternative would not attain any of the project’s objectives. The Mitigated Design Alternative would partially attain the project’s objectives.

NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE - NO DEVELOPMENT

The No-Project Alternative - No Development assumes that existing conditions on the project site would remain. The project site would continue to support existing agricultural land uses and no new facilities would be constructed. Although the City general plan foresees development in this area, this analysis uses existing conditions as the “no-project” scenario, consistent with the requirements of the CEQA Guidelines Section

15126.6. Although this alternative is evaluated herein, it is an unlikely long-term alternative for the project area because of the urban land use designations in the City general plan. Given the City general plan designations for urban development, future development interest in the site is extremely likely. Further, because the City's adopted land uses for this site are similar to land uses proposed for the project, development that would be expected to occur in absence of the project would likely be substantially similar to development proposed by the project. Therefore, to allow meaningful consideration of a range of alternatives, this No-Project Alternative evaluates the continuation of existing agricultural uses at the site in comparison to the project's proposed developed land uses.

Consistent with CEQA requirements, the No-Project Alternative is evaluated in this Draft EIR. The No-Project Alternative would not meet any of the objectives of the project because development of commercial land uses would not occur. In addition, the No-Project Alternative would not be consistent with the intent of the City's general plan, which calls for development of residential and commercial land uses.

NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE – CURRENT ENTITLEMENT

The No Project Alternative – Current Entitlement assumes that the project would be developed with land uses that are consistent with the existing land use and zoning designations. As described in Chapter 3, "Project Description," the City general plan designates the entire site for commercial mixed-use (CMU) land uses. As defined by the City general plan (2003), the CMU designation would accommodate a variety of purposes including residential, employment centers, retail, and commercial and professional offices. The mixed-use concept would integrate a mix of compatible uses on a single site that include sales, services, and activities that residents may need on a daily basis. The project does not include development of any residential uses required by the CMU land use designation; therefore, the project would require a general plan amendment to change the land use designation of the project site to general commercial (GC).

The purpose of this alternative is to provide decision makers with information regarding the development and associated environmental impacts that would occur if the project did not move forward and the site was developed consistent with existing land use and zoning designations. As described above, the project's proposed commercial uses would be consistent with the commercial land uses allowed by the CMU designation; however, the project does not include any residential development required by that designation. As such, if development that was consistent with the CMU designation on the project were to occur, this development would consist of commercial land uses similar to land uses proposed by the project and a portion of the site would contain residential land uses likely of higher density (e.g., apartments) to be compatible with adjacent commercial activities.

The entire project site would be developed similar to the project (i.e., grading of entire site); therefore, site-specific impacts related to biological resources; cultural resources; visual resources; agricultural resources; land use; hydrology and water quality; geology, soils, seismicity; paleontological resources; and hazards and hazardous materials would be the same. Further, the development intensity of the site (e.g., square footage of commercial uses, number of buildings constructed) would be substantially similar to the intensity of development that would occur under the project. While some of the on-site land uses under this alternative would be residential, these land uses result in similar amounts (e.g., length of time, number of buildings) of construction activities and would generate traffic trips (in combination with on-site commercial development) that are similar to the proposed project. Therefore, impacts related to construction- and operational-related air quality, noise, transportation and circulation, public services and utilities, and population, employment, and housing would be similar to the project.

The No Project Alternative – Current Entitlement would result in environmental impacts that would not substantially differ from those evaluated throughout this Draft EIR, and the analysis presented in the Draft EIR is representative of the impacts that would occur under this alternative. Therefore, no further discussion of the environmental impacts of this alternative is needed. Please refer to Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR.

MITIGATED DESIGN ALTERNATIVE

The Mitigated Design Alternative is designed to avoid or reduce several of the environmental impacts identified for the project, including minimizing impacts to farmland, noise compatibility, air quality, traffic, sensitive habitats and species, and cultural resources. With this alternative, a reduced density development would be implemented on a smaller portion of the project site.

This alternative would avoid development of approximately 6 acres in the eastern portion of the site. Elimination of this area from the project site would avoid removal of Farmland of Statewide Importance (6 acres) contained within the project site and would provide a buffer for adjacent residential land uses to the north and east of the project site. In addition, truck delivery areas would be situated in the southwestern portion of the project site, away from residences.

In consideration the project's air quality impacts, it was determined that based on San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) thresholds, the intensity of development on the project site would need to be reduced to approximately 56% of the proposed development to produce emissions that are below significance thresholds (in 2010). A development of this size would meet few if any of the project's objectives because a project of the type proposed could not be constructed (it relies on the mix and type of uses proposed) and the revenue sources associated with a large development would be substantially reduced such that it would prevent the funding of other necessary facilities and services on the project site (e.g., roadway infrastructure, utility infrastructure).

In consideration of the project's transportation impacts, it was determined that a development of any size would still result in significant and unavoidable project and cumulative traffic impacts because several existing intersections and freeway segments are currently operating at unacceptable levels (see Section 4.11, "Transportation and Circulation"), and mitigation is not available or feasible within the timeframe of proposed development. Therefore, even the contribution of only few trips would further exacerbate existing unacceptable operating conditions and would contribute to the significant and unavoidable project and cumulative traffic impacts.

Therefore, the purpose of this analysis is to develop an alternative that would substantially reduce the operational air quality, light and glare, noise, and traffic impacts of the project while providing a development that is of reasonable scale and would meet some of the project objectives. The Mitigated Design Alternative assumes that development on the project site would be reduced by 6 acres or approximately 38% (76,984 square feet). At this level of development, it is anticipated that long-term criteria air pollutants and operational traffic impacts would be substantially reduced compared to the project.

Proposed infrastructure and facilities that would serve the development (i.e., roadways, drainage, utilities, parking spaces, etc.) would be similarly reduced. All existing site agricultural irrigation-related structures in the area where construction would occur would be demolished and removed from the site. Site landscaping and setbacks would be in accordance with applicable City guidelines.

The Mitigated Design Alternative would partially meet project objectives by providing a development that is consistent with land use patterns envisioned by the City's general plan on a portion of the site and at a reduced scale. However, the Mitigated Design Alternative might not be consistent with some project objectives because it may be economically infeasible to develop a project of this size and the ability to provide certain amenities essential to this type of project may be curtailed. Further, the applicant has indicated that a development of this size would not be feasible based on current market conditions: it would reduce the market base of the project reducing the revenue that would be generated to fund infrastructure improvement; many of the infrastructure improvements (e.g., interchanges, freeway widenings) are needed without implementation of the project and reduction of the project at any scale would reduce the revenue available to fund those large-scale improvements; and, a reduced project site limits the number, type, and quality of tenants that would occupy the project site and

could constrain the applicant’s ability to provide a high-quality, aesthetically pleasing, yet functional development.

OFF- SITE ALTERNATIVE

An off-site alternative would require the location of another potentially feasible site for development of uses consistent with those of the project. As directed in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f) (2) (A), “the key question and first step in analysis is whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project in another location.” Because certain significant effects of the project are site-specific (such as the conversion of important farmland and intersection impacts), it would be conceivable that an alternative location could avoid the significant effect. Therefore, it is valid to determine if feasible alternative locations may exist in the area.

The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f) (2) (B) indicates that “if the lead agency concludes that no feasible alternative locations exist, it must disclose the reasons for this conclusion.” If feasible alternative locations do not exist, the EIR analysis need not continue to consider the issue of an off-site alternative.

The area in which it is reasonable to search for alternative sites would be the jurisdiction of the lead agency (i.e., the City of Manteca). A site that could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project would need to be of comparable size, with adequate access to roadways and utilities to support commercial retail development, in a location where these uses would be consistent with the general plan designation and compatible with adjacent uses.

An examination of developable parcels in the City and a review of the *City of Manteca General Plan 2023 Land Use Element* led to the conclusion that one feasible alternative location for the project exists and is approximately 2 miles east of the project site in the City of Manteca. Currently, there is an approximately 95-acre area of undeveloped land east of South Main Street and south of SR 120 that is within the city limits and is of sufficient size to accommodate the 16-acre development. This site is designated for Commercial Mixed Use (CMU) by the City general plan. This land use designation is the same as the existing land use designation for the project site and would be compatible with development proposed for the project. The Off-site Alternative would result in similar land uses and land use patterns as the project.

The Off-site Alternative would meet all but one of the project objectives (because it would not be located near the Stadium Center I and II shopping centers, and would not be an important element of a new gateway development area in the southwestern portion of the City). However, the proposed location for the Off-site Alternative is not owned by the project applicant. Further, it is unknown whether the current land owners would be willing to sell their property. This alternative would require substantial time and investment to research the feasibility of acquiring the site, which makes this alternative potentially infeasible from a development standpoint.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The State CEQA Guidelines require identification of an environmentally superior alternative. If the No Project Alternative is environmentally superior, CEQA requires selection of the “environmentally superior alternative other than the no project alternative” from among the project and the alternatives evaluated.

Table 7-1 identifies whether each of the three alternatives would have “greater,” “less,” or “similar” impacts as the project for each of the 12 environmental issues evaluated in this Draft EIR. The No Project Alternative – No Development would have greater impacts than the project in 1 issue area, lesser impacts in 8, and similar impacts in 3. The Mitigated Design Alternative would have greater impacts than the project in 1 issue area, lesser impacts in 5, and similar impacts in 6. The No Project Alternative – Current Entitlement and Off-site Alternative would have similar impacts to the project in all issue areas.

Based on the listing of lesser and greater impacts as identified in Table 7-1, the No Project Alternative – No Development would appear to be the environmentally superior alternative. The project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts in 4 resource areas: agricultural resources, visual resources, air quality, and transportation. The No Project Alternative – No Development, by comparison would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts. It would have greater impacts than the project with respect to water quality (associated with stormwater runoff from agricultural activities). Nevertheless, because it would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts, it is the environmentally superior alternative and it is superior to all other alternatives considered.

By comparison, the Mitigated Design Alternative would reduce, but not to a less-than-significant level, most of the project’s significant and unavoidable impacts related to agricultural resources, air quality, and transportation. While for most resource areas environmental impacts would be similar, this alternative would achieve the objective of substantially reducing the project’s significant and unavoidable impacts. For these reasons, the Mitigated Design Alternative is environmentally superior to the project.

The environmental effects of the Off-Site Alternative would be comparable to the project, because it would result in the same level of development on a substantially similar site and the same levels of construction and operational impacts (i.e., air quality, noise, traffic, biological resources). This alternative would not reduce or eliminate the project’s listed significant and unavoidable impacts. Overall, this alternative would be environmentally similar to the project.

Finally, for the reasons described above, the No Project Alternative – Current Entitlement would result in substantially similar environmental impacts as the project. This alternative would not reduce or eliminate the project’s listed significant and unavoidable impacts. Overall, this alternative would be environmentally similar to the project.

2.4 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES

Table 2-1, presented at the end of this chapter, provides a summary of the project-specific environmental impacts of the project, the level of significance of the impact before mitigation, recommended mitigation measures, and the level of significance of the impact after implementation of the mitigation measures.

The project would result in project-level significant and unavoidable adverse impacts in four areas: Visual Resources, Air Quality, Agricultural Resources, and Transportation and Circulation. In addition, the project would contribute to cumulative significant and unavoidable adverse impacts in three areas: Visual Resources, Air Quality, and Agricultural Resources.

2.5 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Section 15123 of the CEQA Guidelines requires the summary section of an EIR to include “areas of controversy known to the lead agency.”

The following issues, in no order of importance, are controversial issues known to the City of Manteca:

- ▶ Traffic congestion along area roadways
- ▶ Conversion of farmland to urban uses
- ▶ Visual impacts of the project (i.e., density, lighting, character)
- ▶ Alteration of Land Use and Potential Conflicts with Existing Land Uses

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.1 Land Use			
4.1-1 Land Use — Potential for Division of an Existing Community. The project would not physically divide an established community because the project site is currently vacant and would result in urban development that would be compatible with adjacent urban land uses (e.g., commercial). For this reason, this impact is considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.2 Visual Resources			
4.2-1 Visual Resources — Impacts on a Scenic Vista. No views on or near the project site would be considered a scenic vista. Therefore, development of the project would not alter or obscure views of a scenic vista. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.2-2 Visual Resources — Damage to Scenic Resources within a State Scenic Highway. No state scenic highways are located within the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in damage to scenic resources along a state scenic highway. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.2-3 Visual Resources — Degradation of Visual Character. Implementation of the project would substantially alter the visual character of the project site through conversion of agricultural land to developed urban uses. This would be considered a significant impact.	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.2-3: Visual Resources — Degradation of Visual Character. Because the project would comply with the City’s design and lighting standards, no other feasible mitigation is available to reduce the project’s visual impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Because of the scale and location of the proposed project, there is no feasible mitigation available to address aesthetic resource impacts associated with the conversion of agricultural land to commercial development. Although design, architectural, development, and maintenance standards are included in the project to ensure that commercial development at the project site remains within the City’s aesthetic guidelines, there is no mechanism to allow implementation of the project while avoiding the conversion of the local viewshed from agricultural to commercial development.</p>	SU

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		However, conversion of the agricultural viewshed at the project site to commercial development is identified as a significant impact, and no feasible mitigation is available to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the project's impact to the local visual character of the project site (Impact 4.2-3) would be a significant and unavoidable impact.	
4.2-4 Visual Resources — Impacts from Lighting. The project would require lighting of parking lots, sidewalks, and commercial buildings that could inadvertently cause light and glare for motorists on adjacent roadways and residents on Daniels Street and Laurel Park Circle. The proposed site lighting plan would create a new source of substantial light and glare that would adversely affect nighttime views in the area. Because calculated site lighting levels would exceed the IESNA lighting recommendations for parking lots for three criteria, would not meet IESNA lighting recommendations for one criterion, and would exceed the recommended IDA maximum to average ratios for indirect glare, lighting and glare levels associated with operation of the proposed project would be a significant impact.	S	Mitigation Measure 4.2-4: Visual Resources — Impacts from Lighting. To address elevated site lighting levels throughout most of the site and lower than standard lighting levels in the northeast corner of the site, the applicant shall implement the following measures: 1. Reduce lamp wattages on all pole mounted lighting fixtures from 400W to 250W. 2. Reduce lamp wattages on all wall mounted lighting fixtures to 150W. 3. Include glare shields with all type WL and WL-250 fixtures to reduce back splash. 4. Add one to two fixtures at the northeast corner of the site.	LTS
4.3 Air Quality			
4.3-1 Generation of Short-term Construction-Related Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors. Modeled short-term project-generated ozone precursor emissions from construction equipment for Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the proposed project would not exceed SJVAPCD's significance thresholds of 10 tpy; emissions of ozone precursors would be less than significant. Feasible dust control measures beyond those required by SJVAPCD Regulation VIII are not currently part of the project description. Project-generated, construction-related emissions of PM10 could violate or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, and/or conflict with air quality planning efforts. As a result, this impact would be significant.	S	Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 The following SJVAPCD-recommended enhanced and additional control measures shall be implemented by the project applicant further reduce fugitive PM10 dust emissions. ▶ Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from adjacent project areas with a slope greater than 1%. ▶ Limit traffic speeds on unpaved surfaces to 15 miles per hour (mph) ▶ Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds exceed 20 mph. ▶ Limit area subject to excavation, grading, and other construction activity at any one time.	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.3-2 Generation of Long-Term Operation-Related (Regional) Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Ozone Precursors. Operation-related activities would result in project-generated emissions of ROG or NOx that exceed SJVAPCD’s significance threshold of 10 tpy. Thus, without mitigation, project-generated, operation-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors could violate or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation or conflict with air quality planning efforts. As a result, this impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.3-2a Mitigation to reduce NOx emissions addresses reducing the number of motor vehicle trips and reducing the emissions of individual vehicles under control of the Applicant. The following measures shall be implemented by the Applicant unless it can be demonstrated to the City of Manteca that the measures would not be feasible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The applicant shall require the Stadium Center Operator to operate, maintain, and promote a ride-share program for employees of the various businesses. (b) The applicant shall include one or more secure bicycle parking areas within the property and encourage bicycle riding for both employees and customers. (c) The Lowe’s Home Improvement Warehouse shall be designed to meet Title 24 + 20% energy efficiency standards and shall include photovoltaic cells on the rooftops to achieve an additional 25% reduction in electricity use on an average sunny day. (d) The Lowe’s Home Improvement Warehouse shall include shower and locker facilities for employees to encourage bicycle, walking, and jogging as options for commuting. (e) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.11-9, which requires the applicant to coordinate with the City and modify the project designs to provide appropriate bus transit facilities at the project site. (f) The Applicant shall require that all materials handling equipment operated by the businesses within the facility be electric or use non-diesel engines. <p>Mitigation Measure 4.3-2b While area sources comprise a small fraction of the anticipated NOx emissions, it is the policy of the City of Manteca to require developer to include measures to reduce emissions through energy efficient design. The following measures shall be implemented by the Applicant unless it can be demonstrated to the City of Manteca that the measures would not be feasible: The Applicant shall include features in the lighting, heating, ventilating, and air conditioning design of each building on the site</p>	SU

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		that will result in energy use at least 20% below Title 24 requirements. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.3-2a and 4.3-2b would further reduce operations emissions of ROG and NO _x beyond the required compliance with Rule 9510. The results of implementing these measures can not be reasonably quantified. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable .	
4.3-3 Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Toxic Air Contaminant Emissions. The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial emissions of TACs because construction emissions would be temporary and would rapidly dissipate with distance from the source and proposed operations would not result in the exceedance of the SJVAPCD's screening criteria for project's resulting in significant TAC emissions. As a result, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.3-4 Generation of Long-Term Operation-Related (Local) Mobile-Source Emissions of Carbon Monoxide. The proposed project would generate a trip increase that is less than 1.0% of existing traffic volumes on local area roadways and would not decrease the LOS of these roadways. The proposed project would be defined as a small project (e.g., generates less than 1,000 trips per day) for which no quantitative analysis would be required. Project-generated, long-term operation-related (local) mobile-source emissions of CO would not violate or contribute substantially to a violation of the CAAQS or NAAQS, or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.3-5 Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Odors. The proposed commercial center would not be a major generation source of odors. However, the nature of the businesses that would occupy the shopping center is not known, and one or more of the businesses could be a minor source of objectionable odors, which could adversely affect nearby sensitive receptors. Therefore, this would be a potentially significant impact.	PS	Mitigation Measure 4.3-5 The Applicant shall require all business that occupy the property to install odor-controls as necessary to prevent a substantial dispersion of odors to adjacent residential areas.	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.3-6 Increases in Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Emissions of GHG during construction and operation would be less than the 25,000 tons per year threshold for direct project impact; the direct impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.4 Noise			
4.4-1 Noise — Short-Term Construction Noise. Short-term construction-generated noise levels could exceed the City of Manteca General Plan Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure and Performance Standards for stationary sources (Table 4.4-5), the City of Manteca Zoning Ordinance Noise Performance Standards (Table 4.4-6), or result in a noticeable increase (i.e., increase of 3 dBA or more) in ambient noise levels at existing nearby off-site sensitive land uses. This would be a significant impact.	S	Mitigation Measure 4.4-1: Short-Term Construction Noise a. All outdoor operation of construction equipment shall be limited to the hours from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. daily. b. Construction equipment staging areas shall be set back from nearby off-site sensitive receptors, including the housing northeast and southeast of the project site. c. All construction equipment shall be properly maintained and equipped with noise control, such as mufflers, in accordance with manufacturers' specifications.	LTS
4.4-2 Noise — Long-Term Operational Traffic Noise Impacts. Project implementation would not generate traffic noise levels at nearby noise-sensitive receptors that exceed the City's standards. This impact is considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.4-3 Noise — Stationary- and Area-Source Noise Levels. Long-term operational noise levels associated with proposed facility operations would vary throughout the day. Lowe's operations and equipment such as delivery truck operations, forklifts, roof-mounted mechanical building equipment, and an emergency generator would potentially exceed noise ordinance standards at nearby residences. Consequently, the project's long-term operational noise impact would be considered a significant impact.	S	Mitigation Measure 4.4-3: Stationary- and Area-Source Noise Levels a. The applicant shall incorporate operational measures that prevent noise generated by on-site truck and forklift activity from exceeding the maximum allowable noise exposure standards of the City's general plan of 70 dBA Lmax during daytime hours, and 65 dBA Lmax during nighttime hours in the outdoor activity areas of nearby residents (Table 4.4-5). The following operational measures shall be implemented: 1. Limit on-site truck activity and/or fork lift activity, including the ingress, egress, idling, and waiting of trucks at the site to the daytime hours of 7 a.m. to 10 p.m., or, outside of the hours between 7 a.m. and 10 p.m., require trucks to enter, exit, idle, and wait at on-site locations where no off-site receptors would be exposed to noise exceeding City standards, as calculated by an acoustical engineer. This may involve requiring trucks to enter and	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>exit at the two entrances west of the proposed Lowe’s store building and wait in or near the customer parking area west of the proposed Lowe’s building</p> <p>2. Only operate forklifts that generate noise levels less than 66 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. This can be achieved by selecting a fork lift model based on the noise level data included in the manufacturer’s specifications, choosing a low-noise electric-powered forklift, and/or with the installation of additional shrouds or mufflers.</p> <p>b. In addition, the applicant shall incorporate design measures to reduce exposure of off-site residences to noise generated by on-site truck and forklift activity to levels that are below City standards, as calculated by an acoustical engineer. These design measures may include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <p>1. Construction of a wall, berm, or combination thereof along the southeast side of the site to provide additional attenuation to off-site noise-sensitive receptors. The barrier shall be constructed of solid material (e.g., brick, block, adobe, earth) and be of sufficient height to, at a minimum, block the line of site from the loading dock area to the ground floor of the residences located to the southeast. The barrier shall blend into the overall landscape and have an aesthetically pleasing appearance that agrees with the color and character of the area and not become the dominant visual element of the community.</p> <p>2. Construction of a taller sound wall, up to 8 feet in height, at the location of the existing 6-foot-high masonry wall located along the property line of the affected homes on Laurel Park Circle. This wall shall be constructed of solid material (e.g., brick, block, adobe) and be of sufficient height to, at a minimum, block the line of site from the loading dock area to the ground floor of the residences located to the southeast. This barrier shall blend into the overall landscape and have an aesthetically pleasing appearance that agrees with the color and character of the nearby homes and not become the dominant visual element of the community.</p>	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>3. Relocation of the truckwell and truck turning area to a location located further from the closest off-site noise-sensitive receptors. One such location would be the area between the west corner of the proposed Lowe’s store and the SR 120 off ramp.</p> <p>4. In combination with the existing 6-foot-high masonry wall located along the property line of the homes on Laurel Park Circle, the selected measures shall provide a total of at least 6.7 dBA reduction in truck and forklift noise at the backyards of the affected homes. This would be enough attenuation to reduce noise generated by on-site loading activity to less than the 70 dBA Lmax standard established in the City’s general plan for daytime hours. In addition, prohibiting on-site truck activity and operations at the loading dock during the more noise-sensitive hours of the day would prevent the generation of noise levels that exceed the 65 dBA Lmax standard established in the City’s general plan for nighttime hours. Funding for the implementation of the selected mitigation measures shall be wholly provided by the project applicant. Where there is a question regarding the noise levels before and after mitigation is implemented in a particular area, site-specific noise studies/modeling shall be conducted to determine compliance or noncompliance with standards.</p> <p>c. Mechanical equipment (e.g., heating, ventilation, and air conditioning equipment) shall be located at the farthest distance from and/or be enclosed or shielded from nearby existing noise-sensitive receptors to the extent that their sound levels are below City standards, as calculated by an acoustical engineer.</p> <p>d. The applicant shall incorporate design features to ensure that noise levels generated by the emergency power generator do not exceed the City’s general plan daytime noise standard of 50 dBA Leq or the nighttime standard of 45 dBA Leq at off-site noise-sensitive receptors, as determined by an acoustical engineer. These features may include but are not limited to the following:</p>	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The emergency power generator shall be located at the farthest distance from and/or be enclosed or shielded from nearby existing noise-sensitive receptors. 2. The noise level posted in the manufacturer’s noise specifications shall be considered when selecting a model and a low-noise model shall be selected. 3. The generator shall be properly maintained and equipped with noise control, such as mufflers, in accordance with manufacturers’ specifications. 4. All regular testing of the generator shall occur between the hours from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. <p>Where there is a question regarding the noise levels before and after mitigation is implemented in a particular area, site-specific noise studies/modeling shall be conducted to determine compliance or noncompliance with standards, and the design shall be adjusted so that standards are met. Funding for the installation of this mitigation measure shall be provided by the project applicant.</p>	
<p>4.4-4 Noise — Ground Vibration Levels. Short-term - construction-generated ground vibration levels would not exceed Caltrans’ recommended standard of 0.2 in/sec PPV with respect to the prevention of structural damage for normal buildings or the FTA’s maximum acceptable vibration standard or 80 VdB with respect to human response for residential uses (i.e., annoyance) at vibration-sensitive land uses. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.5 Biological Resources			
<p>4.5-1 Biological Resources — Impacts to Special-Status Plants and Sensitive Habitats. Implementation of the project would not reduce populations of special-status plant species or adversely affect sensitive habitats as there are none on or adjacent to the project site. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.5-2 Biological Resources — Impacts to Special-Status Wildlife. Implementation of the project would result in conversion of approximately 16 acres of fallow agricultural field that could provide potential foraging habitat for special-status birds. Project implementation could also lead to the disturbance of bird nesting habitat in trees adjacent to the site, potentially resulting in the loss of active nests. This impact would be considered potentially significant.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.5-2: Impacts to Special-Status Wildlife. The project applicant is committed to obtaining coverage under the SJMSCP to mitigate for project impacts and obtain incidental take authorization for SJMSCP-covered species under the City of Manteca’s Section 10(a) and Section 2081 permits. Compensation for significant impacts on all SJMSCP-covered species would be accomplished through payment of development fees for conversion of open space lands that may provide habitat for these species. Development fees would be paid to the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) in the amount specified by SJCOG, which administers the SJMCSP.</p> <p>In addition, incidental take avoidance and minimization measures for species that could be significantly affected as a result of the project would be implemented, as determined by the SJCOG, and in accordance with requirements of the SJMSCP. Potentially suitable nesting habitat for Swainson’s hawk, white-tailed kite, northern harrier, burrowing owl, and loggerhead shrike is currently present in the project area and could be affected by project implementation. During the SJMSCP application process, SJCOG will determine whether the project site supports suitable nesting habitat for these species. If SJCOG determines suitable habitat is present on or adjacent to the project site, the following SJMSCP incidental take avoidance and minimization measures for applicable special status birds shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Swainson’s Hawk: Project-related construction activities (such as equipment movement, truck movement, and equipment or materials deliveries to the project site) could require the trimming or removal of nearby trees. If any trees adjacent to the site with potential to support Swainson’s hawk nests must be removed, the tree shall be removed only during the nonbreeding season between September 16 and February 28. If a nest tree adjacent to the site becomes occupied during construction activities, then a qualified biologist shall conduct a survey to determine if Swainson’s hawks are nesting immediately adjacent to the site. The survey shall be conducted within one week prior to beginning of construction. If construction would occur during the nesting season (March 1 – 	<p>LTS</p>

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>September 15), then all construction activities shall remain a distance of two times the dripline of the tree, measured from the nest. A setback of this distance shall be established and maintained during the nesting season for the period encompassing nest building and continuing until fledglings leave the nest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Burrowing Owl: The presence of ground squirrels and squirrel burrows are attractive to burrowing owls. Burrowing owls may therefore be discouraged from entering or occupying construction areas by discouraging the presence of ground squirrels. To accomplish this, the project applicant should prevent ground squirrels from occupying the project site early in the planning process by employing one of the following practices: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project applicant may plant new vegetation or retain existing vegetation entirely covering the site at a height of approximately 36” above the ground. Vegetation should be retained until construction begins. Vegetation will discourage both ground squirrel and owl use of the site. • Alternatively, because burrowing owls are not known or suspected on the project site and the project area is an unlikely occupation site for red-legged frogs, San Joaquin kit fox, or tiger salamanders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project applicant may disc or plow the entire project site to destroy any ground squirrel burrows. At the same time burrows are destroyed, ground squirrels should be removed through one of the approved methods described in Appendix A of the SJMSCP to prevent reoccupation of the project site. If these measures are not attempted or are attempted but fail, and burrowing owls are known to occupy the project site, then the following measures shall be implemented: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - During the non-breeding season (September 1 through January 31) burrowing owls occupying the project site should be evicted from the project 	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>site by passive relocation as described in DFG’s Staff Report on Burrowing Owls (1995)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - During the breeding season (February 1 through August 31) occupied burrows shall not be disturbed and shall be provided with a 75 meter protective buffer until and unless the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), with the concurrence of the Permitting Agencies’ representatives on the TAC; or unless a qualified biologist approved by the Permitting Agencies verifies through non-invasive means that either: 1) the birds have not begun egg laying, or 2) juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival. Once the fledglings are capable of independent survival, the burrow can be destroyed. ▶ White-tailed Kite: Preconstruction surveys shall investigate all potential nesting trees within 150 feet of the project site (e.g., especially tree tops 15-59 feet above the ground in oak, willow, eucalyptus, cottonwood, or other deciduous trees), during the nesting season (February 15 to September 15) whenever white-tailed kites are noted on-site or within the vicinity of the project site during the nesting season. A setback of 100 feet from nesting areas shall be established and maintained during the nesting season for the period encompassing nest building and continuing until fledglings leave nests. This setback applies whenever construction or other ground-disturbing activities must begin during the nesting season in the presence of nests which are known to be occupied. Setbacks shall be marked by brightly colored temporary fencing. ▶ Northern harrier: A setback of 500 feet from nesting areas shall be established and maintained during the nesting season for the period encompassing nest building and continuing until fledglings leave nests. This setback applies whenever construction or other ground-disturbing activities must begin during the nesting season in the presence of nests which are 	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>known to be occupied. Setbacks shall be marked by brightly colored temporary fencing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Loggerhead Shrike: A setback of 100 feet from nesting areas shall be established and maintained during the nesting season for the period encompassing nest building and continuing until fledglings leave nests. This setback applies whenever construction or other ground-disturbing activities must begin during the nesting season in the presence of nests which are known to be occupied. Setbacks shall be marked by brightly colored temporary fencing. 	
<p>4.5-3 Biological Resources — Impacts to Common Raptors. Implementation of the project could result in loss of active nests of common raptors (protected under California Fish and Game Code Section 3503.5) through the disturbance of nests and nesting pairs in nest trees adjacent to the project site. This is considered a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.5-3: Impacts to Common Raptors.</p> <p>To avoid and minimize potential project effects on common raptors, the project applicant shall do the following:</p> <p>If project activity would commence during the raptor nesting season (February 15 to September 15), preconstruction surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist during the nesting season. The surveys shall cover all areas of suitable nesting habitat within 500 feet of project activity and shall be conducted within 14 days prior to commencement of project activity. If no active nests are found, no further mitigation shall be required.</p> <p>If active nests are found, impacts shall be avoided by establishment of appropriate buffers. No project activity shall commence within the buffer area until a qualified biologist confirms that the nest is no longer active. DFG guidelines recommend implementation of 500-foot buffers, but the size of the buffer may be adjusted if a qualified biologist determines adverse affects to the nest are not likely. Monitoring of the nest by a qualified biologist may be required if the activity has potential to adversely affect the nest.</p>	<p>LTS</p>
<p>4.5-4 Biological Resources — Impacts to Wildlife Movement. Implementation of the project would not substantially interfere with wildlife movement or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is necessary.</p>	<p>LTS</p>

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.5-5 Biological Resources — Consistency with Local Plans, Policies, and Ordinances. Implementation of the project might conflict or be inconsistent with local policies and ordinances including the City of Manteca general plan. This would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.5-5: Consistency with Federal, State, and Local Plans, Policies, and Ordinances. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.5-2 and 4.5-3 would sufficiently address measures necessary to mitigate for Impact 4.5-5.</p>	LTS
<p>4.5-6 Biological Resources — Consistency with Adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or Other Approved Conservation Plan. Implementation of the project would not conflict with or be inconsistent with the above plans because the project applicant intends to participate in the San Joaquin Multi-Species Conservation Plan (SJMSCP). This is a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
<p>4.6-1 Hazards and Hazardous Materials — Create a Safety Hazard to Construction Workers and Residents. Although no hazardous environmental conditions have been identified to date on the project site, past agricultural and farming operations at the project site could have resulted in contamination of soil and/or groundwater in some locations. In addition, demolition, excavation, and construction activities at the project site could result in the exposure of construction workers to previously undiscovered hazardous materials, including asbestos, petroleum hydrocarbons, and pesticides. The presence of contamination in on-site soils could create a significant environmental or health hazard if left in place. This would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.6-1: Create a Safety Hazard to Construction Workers and Residents.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. To avoid health risks to construction workers, prior to issuance of a grading permit the applicant shall prepare a site Health and Safety Plan. This plan will outline measures that shall be employed to protect construction workers and the public from exposure to hazardous materials during demolition and construction activities. These measures could include, but would not be limited to, posting notices, limiting access to the site, air monitoring, watering, and installation of wind fences. Development contractors shall be required to comply with state health and safety standards for all demolition work. If necessary, this shall include compliance with OSHA and Cal-OSHA requirements regarding exposure to asbestos and lead-based paint. b. Before demolition of any structures associated with past and current farming operations (i.e., irrigation control structures, irrigation well, pump, and any Transite piping) or grading in any areas of previously undiscovered contamination, the project applicant shall investigate the extent to which soil and/or groundwater has been contaminated from past operations. This 	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>investigation shall follow ESA and/or other appropriate testing guidelines and shall include, as necessary, analysis of soil and/or groundwater samples taken at or near potential contamination sites. If the results indicate that contamination exists at levels above regulatory action standards, then the SJCDEH shall be notified and the site shall be remediated in accordance with recommendations made by SJCDEH, RWQCB, DTSC, or other appropriate federal, state, or local regulatory agencies. The agencies involved would depend on the type and extent of contamination. Remediation activities could include but would not be limited to the excavation of contaminated soil areas and hauling of contaminated soil materials to an appropriate off-site disposal facility, mixing of on-site soils, and capping (i.e., paving or sealing) of contaminated areas.</p> <p>c. The project contractors shall prepare a site plan that identifies any necessary remediation activities appropriate for proposed land uses, including excavation and removal of on-site contaminated soils, and redistribution of clean fill material on the project site. The plan shall include measures that ensure the safe transport, use, and disposal of contaminated soil and building debris removed from the site. In the event that contaminated groundwater is encountered during site excavation activities, the contractor shall report the contamination to the appropriate regulatory agencies, dewater the excavated area, and treat the contaminated groundwater to remove contaminants before discharge in the sanitary sewer system. The development contractors shall be required to comply with the plan and applicable local, state, and federal laws and the requirements of the City of Manteca for dewatering discharge. The plan shall outline measures for specific handling and reporting procedures for hazardous materials, and disposal of hazardous materials removed from the site at an appropriate off-site disposal facility.</p> <p>In addition, the following measures shall apply to construction activities as appropriate.</p> <p>(1) The SJCDEH shall be notified if evidence of previously</p>	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>undiscovered soil or groundwater contamination (e.g., stained soil, odorous groundwater) is encountered during excavation. Any contaminated areas shall be remediated in accordance with recommendations made by SJCDEH, RWQCB, DTSC, or other appropriate federal, state, or local regulatory agencies as generally described above.</p> <p>(2) Before demolition of any Transite piping, the project applicant shall hire a qualified consultant to investigate whether any of this piping, including recently demolished piping, contain asbestos-containing materials that could become friable or mobile during demolition activities. If found, the asbestos-containing materials shall be removed by an accredited inspector in accordance with EPA and Cal-OSHA standards. In addition, all activities (construction or demolition) in the vicinity of these materials shall comply with Cal-OSHA asbestos worker construction standards. The asbestos-containing materials shall be disposed of properly at an appropriate off-site disposal facility.</p>	
<p>4.6-2 Hazards and Hazardous Materials — Create a Significant Hazard to the Public or the Environment. The project would involve the storage, use, and transport of hazardous materials at the project site during construction activities. In addition, because the project includes commercial uses, it is possible that some facilities could use or store hazardous materials during operation. However, use of hazardous materials at the site would be in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. Therefore, impacts related to creation of significant hazards to the public or the environment through routine transport, storage, use, disposal, and risk of upset would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<p>4.6-3 Hazards and Hazardous Materials — Potential Wildfire Hazard. The project site is not located in a designated wildland fire area or a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to significant risk of loss or injury involving wildland fires. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.7 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity			
<p>4.7-1 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity — Risks to People and Structures Caused by Strong Seismic Ground Shaking. The project site is approximately 23 miles from the nearest potentially active fault and is located in CBC Seismic Zone 3. Project facilities would be designed in accordance with CBC seismic standards for structures located within Zone 3. However, in the event of a moderate to major seismic event along the Great Valley fault, ground shaking could result in lateral forces exceeding the capabilities of structures built to minimum CBC design standards. Severe structural and nonstructural damage and associated hazards resulting from such a seismic event would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.7-1: Risks to People and Structures Caused by Strong Seismic Ground Shaking.</p> <p>a. Before contract bidding for project construction, the approved project design plans and specifications, including grading and foundation plans, shall be reviewed by a soils engineer approved by the City. This review shall be completed to assess whether the recommendations in the geotechnical report (prepared by Kleinfelder 2005) are sufficient for construction of the buildings described in the final project design plans. If these measures are deemed insufficient, the geotechnical engineer shall prepare a supplemental site-specific geotechnical report with appropriate recommendations sufficient to ensure the safety of project structures and site occupants. These measures could include, but are not limited to, the construction of deep foundations, installation of driven piles (if needed), and extra reinforcement of foundation slabs. At a minimum, these measures shall demonstrate that the proposed project design would meet CBC and City design standards.</p> <p>b. During project design and construction, all measures outlined in the geotechnical report for the proposed project (Kleinfelder 2005) and, if necessary, measures included in supplemental site-specific geotechnical report(s), shall be implemented to ensure that project structures and site occupants would be safe during seismic events. These measures could include, but are not limited to, the construction of deep foundations, installation of driven piles (if needed, but not currently proposed), and extra reinforcement of foundation slabs. At a minimum, these measures shall demonstrate that the proposed design would meet CBC and City design standards.</p> <p>c. The on-site soils will likely be saturated by rainfall in the winter and early spring months. If the construction schedule requires continued work during the wet months, the City shall require the applicant to consult with a qualified civil engineer and implement any additional recommendations provided, as conditions warrant. These measures could include, but are not</p>	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		limited to, the construction of deep foundations, installation of driven piles (if needed), and extra reinforcement of foundation slabs. At a minimum, these measures shall demonstrate that the proposed design would meet CBC and City design standards.	
4.7-2 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity — Risks to People and Structures Caused by Seismic-Related Ground Failure. The project site is susceptible to seismic events. Based on the underlying soil conditions in the project area and the depth of the groundwater table, construction of the proposed project has the potential to expose people or structures to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and differential settlement. Therefore, this impact is considered potentially significant.	PS	Mitigation Measure 4.7-2: Risks to People and Structures Caused by Seismic-Related Ground Failure. The applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-1, described above, to reduce the seismic-related ground failure risks to people and structures at the proposed project site.	LTS
4.7-3 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity — Construction-Related Erosion Hazards. Based on soil types and topography, excavation and grading of soil could result in erosion during project construction, particularly during periods of strong winds. This impact is considered potentially significant.	PS	Mitigation Measure 4.7-3: Construction-Related Erosion Hazards. a. A grading and erosion control plan shall be prepared by a California Registered Civil Engineer and submitted to the Manteca Department of Public Works prior to issuance of any grading permits. The plan shall be consistent with CBC grading requirements and shall include the site-specific grading proposed for the new development. The project applicant shall ensure that the construction contractor is responsible for securing a source of transportation and deposition of excavated materials. b. BMPs for erosion and siltation prevention, as further described in Section 4.9, “Hydrology and Water Quality” of this document, shall be implemented at the project site during all construction activities. The project applicant shall consult with the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board to acquire the appropriate regulatory approvals that may be necessary to obtain Section 401 water quality certification, State Water Board statewide NPDES stormwater permit for general construction activity, and any other necessary site-specific waste discharge requirements (WDRs) or waivers. As required under the NPDES stormwater permit for general construction activity, the project applicant shall prepare and	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>submit the appropriate Notice of Intent (NOI) and prepare the SWPPP and any other necessary engineering plans and specifications for pollution prevention and control. The SWPPP and other appropriate plans shall identify and specify the use of erosion and sediment control BMPs, means of waste disposal, implementation of approved local plans, nonstormwater management controls, permanent postconstruction BMPs, and inspection and maintenance responsibilities. The SWPPP would also specify the pollutants that are likely to be used during construction that could be present in stormwater drainage and nonstormwater discharges. A sampling and monitoring program would be included in the SWPPP that meets the requirements of State Water Board Order 99-08-DWQ to ensure that the BMPs are effective.</p> <p>c. Prior to issuance of grading permits, construction techniques shall be identified that would reduce the potential for runoff, and the grading and erosion control plan shall identify the erosion and sedimentation control measures to be implemented. The SWPPP shall also specify spill prevention and contingency measures, identify the types of materials used for equipment operation, and identify measures to prevent or clean up spills of hazardous materials used for equipment operation and hazardous waste. Emergency procedures for responding to spills shall also be identified. BMPs identified in the SWPPP shall be used in all subsequent site development activities. The SWPPP shall identify personnel training requirements and procedures that would be used to ensure that workers are aware of permit requirements and proper installation and performance inspection methods for BMPs specified in the SWPPP. The SWPPP shall also identify the appropriate personnel responsible for supervisory duties related to implementation of the SWPPP. All construction contractors shall retain a copy of the approved SWPPP on the construction site.</p>	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.7-4 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity — Risks to People and Structures Resulting from Unstable Soil Conditions. Soils on the project site have a very low clay content and are rated by the NRCS as non-plastic (no shrink-swell potential). Based on this information, there is a low potential for shrink-swell soils at the project site to cause damage to project structures. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<p>4.7-5 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity — Risk of Structural Damage Caused by Corrosive Soils. The corrosiveness of on-site soils was not tested to determine whether the soils could cause damage to buried concrete slabs, concrete foundations and buried metal pipes during the operation of the proposed project. Therefore, without additional information, the potential exists for on-site structures to be corroded or otherwise damaged by the presence of corrosive soils. This impact is considered potentially significant</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.7-5: Risk of Structural Damage Caused by Corrosive Soils. A design recommendation study for the proposed project site shall be completed by a qualified corrosion engineer before any grading permit is issued. The study shall specifically address corrosive soils where damage to underground facilities may occur and shall provide recommendations, if needed, that the project applicant shall implement. Potential methods to address corrosive soils include the use of cathodic protection or sacrificial anodes for buried metals, use of concrete with a lower water-to-cement ratio and/or sulfate-resistant concrete, and the use of Type II or Type II modified cement. Appropriate measures identified in the design-level study and approved by the City shall be implemented during project construction.</p>	LTS
<p>4.8 Agricultural Resources</p>			
<p>4.8-1 Agricultural Resources — Direct Conversion of 16 Acres of Important Farmland to Nonagricultural Urban Use. Implementation of the project would result in the direct conversion of approximately 16 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural urban use. Conversion of Important Farmland would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.8-1: Direct Conversion of 16 Acres of Important Farmland to Nonagricultural Urban Use. The project applicant shall pay the required City of Manteca agricultural mitigation fee to help offset the conversion of Important Farmland. Consistent with Chapter 13.42 of the Manteca Municipal Code, a \$2,000 agricultural mitigation fee shall be assessed for every acre of Important Farmland that would be developed as part of the proposed project. A total of \$32,000 (\$2,000 multiplied by 16 acres) shall be provided to the City. Under the City’s program, the fees collected would be used to acquire farmland conservation easements and/or farmland deed restrictions. Consistent with goals of the City’s Right To Farm ordinance, this mitigation measure would help reduce the occurrence of conflicts between nonagricultural and agricultural land uses due to</p>	SU

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>development pressures by preserving agricultural lands located within the project vicinity.</p> <p>Implementation of this mitigation measure would substantially lessen significant impacts associated with the conversion of 16 acres of Important Farmland on the project site because funding conservation easements would provide assistance to the public and private sectors in protecting other farmland from the pressures of development. The agricultural mitigation fee would be used to specifically purchase farmland easements and/or farmland deed restrictions to partially offset project impacts; however, 16 acres would still be unavoidably lost. In addition, no new farmland would be made available and the productivity of existing farmland would not be improved as a result of this mitigation measure. Therefore, full compensation for losses of Important Farmland would not be achieved. No other feasible mitigation is available. Impact 4.8-1 (Direct Conversion of 16 Acres of Important Farmland to Nonagricultural Urban Use) would remain significant and unavoidable after mitigation.</p>	
<p>4.8-2 Agricultural Resources — Conflict with Surrounding Agricultural Operations. The proposed project is adjacent to a fallow parcel to the north. While agricultural operations adjacent to urban development typically results in potential land use conflicts (e.g., increased dust generation, noise from farming equipment, odors from fertilizer applications), these potential adverse interfaces are not expected to occur adjacent to the Lowe’s property because urban development is approved or already exists adjacent to the site and there are no plans for active agricultural operations to be implemented prior to development of undeveloped lands. The project would result in less-than-significant conflicts with surrounding agricultural operations.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality			
<p>4.9-1 Hydrology and Water Quality–Temporary Construction-Related Water Quality Effects. Temporary construction-related ground disturbances on the project site could result in the discharge of stormwater and non-stormwater discharges containing pollutants to nearby drainage systems and ultimately into the San Joaquin River. The discharge of pollutants to local waterways would be a potentially significant construction-related water quality impact.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.9-1: Temporary Construction-Related Water Quality Effects. The project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-3, “Construction-Related Erosion Hazards.</p>	LTS
<p>4.9-2 Hydrology and Water Quality–Long-Term Water Quality Effects of Urban Runoff. The project would convert agricultural land to commercial shopping center use, and thereby change the amount and timing of potential waste discharges in stormwater runoff. Because specifics related to the stormwater drainage system and water quality treatment features that would be constructed to serve the project site are unknown at this time, the storm drain system would have the potential to discharge urban and construction-related contaminants into SSJID water drainage facilities. Therefore, this would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.9-2: Long-Term Water Quality Effects of Urban Runoff. The project applicant shall implement permanent water quality features (BMPs) designed in conformance with standards of the Central Valley RWQCB, the City of Manteca, and SSJID. The applicant shall submit designs for these features to the City prior to issuance of a grading permit. The project applicant shall implement BMPs such as, but not limited to, the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The project applicant shall ensure that post-development peak stormwater runoff discharge rates do not exceed the estimated pre-development rate to decrease the potential for downstream erosion. To address peak stormwater discharge rates, the project applicant shall confirm that the Dutra NE stormwater basin is properly sized to accommodate the proposed project. b) The project shall be designed to minimize, to the maximum extent practicable, the introduction of pollutants of concern that may result in significant impacts, generated from site runoff of directly connected impervious areas, to the storm water conveyance system as approved by the City. Pollutants of concern consist of any pollutants that exhibit one or more of the following characteristics: current loadings or historic deposits of the pollutant are adversely affecting the beneficial uses of a receiving water, elevated levels of the pollutant are found in sediments of a receiving water and/or have the potential to bioaccumulate in organisms therein, or the detectable inputs of the pollutant are at concentrations or loads considered potentially toxic to humans and/or flora and fauna. 	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>c) The project applicant shall provide storm drain system stenciling and signage, where appropriate. Storm drain stencils are highly visible source controls that are typically placed directly adjacent to storm drain inlets. The stencil contains a brief statement that prohibits the dumping of improper materials into the storm water conveyance system. Graphical icons, either illustrating anti-dumping symbols or images of receiving water fauna, are effective supplements to the anti-dumping message. All storm drain inlets and catch basins within the project area shall be stenciled with prohibitive language (e.g., NO DUMPING – DRAINS TO RIVER) and/or graphical icons to discourage illegal dumping.</p> <p>d) Where proposed project plans include outdoor areas for storage of materials that may contribute pollutants to the storm water conveyance system, the following structural or treatment BMPs shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ materials with the potential to contaminate storm water shall be: (1) placed in an enclosure such as, but not limited to, a cabinet, shed, or similar structure that prevents contact with runoff or spillage to the storm water conveyance system; or (2) protected by secondary containment structures such as berms, dikes, or curbs; ▶ the storage area shall be paved and sufficiently impervious to contain leaks and spills; and ▶ the storage area shall have a roof or awning to minimize collection of storm water within the secondary containment area. <p>e) To minimize the off-site transport of pollutants in parking areas, the applicant shall implement stormwater BMPs, such as bioretention areas in landscaping or any swale areas (to the maximum extent feasible), to infiltrate or treat runoff.</p> <p>Implementation of nonstructural BMPs, through various public education and outreach programs maintained by the City under the municipal NPDES stormwater permit, would also serve to limit the types, amounts, and likely discharges of urban runoff into stormwater.</p>	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.9-3 Hydrology and Water Quality–Potential On-site and Off-site Flooding Risk from Increased Stormwater Runoff. Project implementation would increase the area of impervious surfaces on-site, thereby resulting in increased surface runoff and discharge. Approximately 18 acre-feet per day of stormwater would be discharged to the Dutra NE storm drainage system. The project involves construction of a stormwater runoff collection system to provide on-site stormwater collection discharge capacity, and the existing Dutra NE storm drainage basin provides storage and discharge capacity sufficient to protect the project site during a 48-hour, 100-year flood event and avoid off-site flooding. Therefore, this would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<p>4.9-4 Hydrology and Water Quality–Impacts to Groundwater. The project would increase demands for domestic water supplies to serve project development. To meet water supply demands, the City of Manteca has a conjunctive use water supply system that draws water from groundwater wells and uses surface water supplied from the SCWSP. The City’s participation in this project eliminated its exclusive reliance on groundwater for water supplies and allows the City to maintain groundwater pumping yields within the sustainable yields of the underlying aquifer. The potential for groundwater overdraft or substantial lowering (i.e., 10 feet or more) of local groundwater levels is not anticipated to occur because these effects are minimized through implementation of the SCWSP water supply system in the City. Therefore, groundwater impacts would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<p>4.9-5 Hydrology and Water Quality–Reduction in Groundwater Recharge. The project site does not serve as a substantial groundwater recharge area. Therefore, development of the site would result in a less-than-significant groundwater recharge impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.10 Public Services and Utilities			
<p>4.10-1 Public Services and Utilities — Increased Demand for Water Supply, Treatment, Storage, and Distribution. Although the project would increase potable and landscape water demands, adequate water supplies (i.e., groundwater and surface water) would be available to serve the proposed project over the long-term. Water would be conveyed to the project site by water mains in Daniels Street and Airport Way, and distributed throughout the project site via new water distribution lines constructed as part of the project. Because adequate water supply and distribution facilities are available and no new or expanded facilities would be required to serve the project, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<p>4.10-2 Public Services and Utilities — Environmental Impacts Associated with the SSJID SCWSP. The proposed project creates a demand for potable water provided by the SCWSP. According to the EIR prepared for the SSJID SCWSP, construction and operation of these facilities could contribute to significant impacts for the following issue areas: hydrology, flooding, and water quality; air quality; geology, soils, and seismicity; biological resources; noise; hazardous materials/public health; visual resources; transportation and traffic circulation; public services and utilities/energy; cultural resources; and recreation. The SCWSP would provide municipal water to the City, including the proposed project. These impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the SCWSP EIR.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<p>4.10-3 Public Services and Utilities — Increased Demand for Wastewater Treatment and Conveyance Facilities. Although implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for wastewater treatment and conveyance facilities, existing wastewater treatment facilities would be adequate to serve the proposed project, and no expansion of these facilities would be required. This impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.10-4 Public Services and Utilities — Increased Generation of Solid Waste. Although the proposed project would increase solid waste generation, Forward Landfill, which would receive solid waste from the project site, has sufficient available capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste demands through 2020. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<p>4.10-5 Public Services and Utilities — Increased Demand for Electricity and Natural Gas and Required Extension of Electrical and Natural Gas Infrastructure. Implementation of the project would increase demand for natural gas and electricity in the City. However, the energy demands created by the project are not substantial in relation to the total energy supplied by PG&E in its northern and central California service area (estimated in 2006 to be 24,967 million KW per day) or energy demands expected in the future. Proposed on-site natural gas and electrical infrastructure improvements would be required to comply with existing City, PG&E, and applicable Uniform Building Code requirements, and would be sufficient to serve the project. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<p>4.10-6 Public Services and Utilities — Increased Demand for Fire Protection Facilities and Services. Development of the proposed project would result in increased demand for fire protection services. The proposed project would be required to pay development fees to cover the costs of equipment and services, and would meet the minimum necessary fire protection and safety requirements identified in applicable codes and regulations. The City fire department currently has adequate staff and facilities to serve proposed project land uses, and a full fire protection system would be installed in the Lowe’s Home Improvement Warehouse (Mears, pers. comm., 2007). Therefore, adequate fire protection staff and facilities are available to serve the project site. This impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.10-7 Public Services and Utilities — Increased Demand for Fire Flow. The proposed project would include fire suppression facilities that would provide adequate fire flow capacity consistent with City standards. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.10-8 Public Services and Utilities — Increased Demand for Police Protection Facilities and Services. Development of the proposed project would increase demand for police protection facilities and services. However, the project would contribute sales tax revenue which would help ensure funding for any additional necessary officers or equipment, and existing and future police protection services would have the capability to adequately serve the proposed development (Halford, pers. comm., 2007). This impact is considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.10-9 Public Services and Utilities — Impacts on Existing Utility Corridors. Development of the proposed project could potentially disrupt existing aboveground and underground utility facilities in the project area, resulting in interruption of service. This would be a potentially significant impact.	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.10-9: Impacts on Existing Utility Corridors.</p> <p>PG&E owns and operates natural gas and electric facilities that are located within and adjacent to the proposed project area. To promote the safe and reliable maintenance and operation of utility facilities, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has mandated specific clearance requirements between utility facilities and surrounding objects or construction activities. To ensure compliance with these standards, the City of Manteca will coordinate with PG&E early in the development of project plans. Any proposed development plans will provide for unrestricted utility access and prevent easement encroachments that might impair the safe and reliable maintenance and operation of PG&E’s facilities.</p> <p>The project applicant shall be responsible for the costs associated with the relocation of existing PG&E facilities to accommodate the development of the proposed project. Because facilities relocations require long lead times and are not always feasible, the applicant is encouraged to consult with PG&E as early in the planning stages as possible. Relocations of PG&E’s electric transmission and substation facilities (50,000 volts and above) could also require formal approval from the CPUC. If required, this approval process</p>	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		could take up to 2 years to complete. The City will consult with PG&E for additional information and assistance in the development of its project schedule to reduce effects on utility service associated with project development.	

4.11 Transportation and Circulation

<p>4.11-1 Transportation and Circulation—Increases in Peak Hour Traffic Volumes on Regional Roadways Resulting in Unacceptable Levels of Service. The proposed project would cause an increase in p.m. peak hour traffic volumes that would result in unacceptable levels of service and warrant the need for improvements at five intersections. Because the project would result in an unacceptable operating condition based on applicable standards, this impact would be significant.</p>	<p align="center">S</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-1: Pay Fair Share Cost for the Installation of Traffic Signals at Two Intersections.</p> <p>a. The project applicant shall coordinate with the City of Manteca to determine and to pay the project’s fair-share costs of the installation of traffic signals at the following intersections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Airport Way and SR 120 Westbound Ramps and ▶ Airport Way and SR 120 Eastbound Ramps. <p>Installation of these traffic signals would improve operation of these study intersections to LOS D or better. The traffic signals at the ramp terminals on Airport Way are funded and are expected to be operational by February 2008. Because the City’s existing PFIP is the funding source for this traffic signal, the project applicant’s payment of the most current PFIP fee at the time the building permit is issued would cover the fair-share cost of the traffic signals.</p> <p>b. To mitigate for the project’s contribution to impacts to the intersections listed below, the project applicant shall make a fair-share contribution (currently estimated at 9.5% of the total costs) toward the unfunded portion of the intersection improvements. The fair-share percentage and the dollar amount of the fee/contribution will be determined at the time of final map approval.</p> <p>Project traffic would exacerbate currently unacceptable LOS at the following intersections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Union Road and Daniels Street, ▶ Union Road and State Route 120 Westbound Ramps, and ▶ Union Road and State Route 120 Eastbound Ramps. <p>Traffic signals are warranted at the above intersections. Installation of these traffic signals would improve unacceptable LOS to LOS D or better during a.m. and p.m. peak hours. While the installation of</p>	<p align="center">SU</p>
---	-------------------------	---	--------------------------

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>traffic signals would provide acceptable operations at these study intersections, the impact is significant and unavoidable for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Full funding for the signalization improvements has not been identified. ▶ The timeline for completion of the interchange improvements is unknown. ▶ The signalization improvements at the Union Road/SR 120 intersections are outside the control of the city or the project applicant and implementation cannot be guaranteed. <p>For certain intersections (Union Road / Daniels Street, Union Road / SR 120 westbound ramps, and Union Road / SR 120 eastbound ramps), full funding for the signalization improvements has not been identified, the timeline for completion of the interchange improvements is unknown, and recommended improvements are subject to the control of Caltrans and/or it is unknown whether the improvements would be implemented at the time the project builds out. Therefore, for purposes of CEQA, this would be considered a significant and unavoidable interim impact.</p>	
<p>4.11-2 Transportation and Circulation—Increases in Project-Related Traffic Volumes on Local Roadway Segments. The traffic analysis concluded that the addition of project-generated traffic to local roadway segments would not degrade currently acceptable LOS conditions to unacceptable conditions based on City of Manteca significance thresholds. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<p>4.11-3 Transportation and Circulation—Increases in Project-Related Traffic Volumes on Freeway Operations. The project would increase traffic volumes along freeway mainline segments and ramp junctions of SR 120. The addition of project-generated traffic to freeway mainline segments would degrade currently acceptable LOS conditions to unacceptable conditions. This would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-3: Implement Measures to Reduce Project Impacts on Freeway Operations. The addition of project-generated traffic would exacerbate unacceptable LOS at the following freeway mainline segment, based on Caltrans standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ State Route 120 Eastbound, between Yosemite Avenue and Airport Way (p.m. peak hour) and ▶ State Route 120 Westbound, between Airport Way and Yosemite Avenue (a.m. peak hour). 	SU

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Widening SR 120 from four to six lanes (three in each direction) would provide LOS C or better conditions for the freeway mainline segments identified above. Widening improvements are identified in the SJCOG Regional Transportation Plan as a Tier 1 improvement. Funding was originally anticipated to come from the SJCOG regional transportation impact fee, but this fee has not kept up with cost increases. Measure K was passed on the November 2006 ballot and funding for this improvement is included in Measure K. Measure K would authorize the collection of retail transaction and use taxes, which would be used to implement projects identified in the SJCOG's (i.e., the Local Transportation Authority's) adopted transportation plan. While funding would be available and the project would contribute its fair share by paying the regional transportation impact fee, it is unknown when this improvement would be implemented. Because the timeframe for the widening improvement is unknown and the improvement is outside the control of the City or the project applicant, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable. Nonetheless, the project applicant shall pay the SJCOG regional transportation fee (\$1.00 per square foot of commercial space) when building permits are issued to mitigate for its contribution to impacts to regional transportation facilities.</p> <p>Because the timeframe for widening improvements is unknown and improvements would be outside the control of the City or the project applicant, no feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the project's impact to operation of SR 120 on the westbound mainline segment between Airport Way and Yosemite Avenue during a.m. peak hours and on the eastbound mainline segment between Yosemite Avenue and Airport Way during p.m. peak hours (Impact 4.11-3). Therefore, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	
<p>4.11-4 Transportation and Circulation—Increases in Peak Hour Traffic Volumes on Regional Roadways Resulting in Unacceptable Levels of Service under Cumulative Plus Project Conditions (2015). Operational traffic conditions for cumulative conditions at most intersections in the project study area would operate at an unacceptable LOS. The project would</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-4 (a): Pay Fair Share of Intersection Improvements at Airport Way/Yosemite Avenue. To help implement these improvements, the project applicant shall make a fair-share contribution toward the unfunded portion of the intersection improvements. The fair-share percentage and the dollar amount of the fee/contribution will be determined at the time of</p>	<p>SU</p>

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>exacerbate unacceptable LOS that would exceed the City of Manteca’s LOS thresholds under cumulative conditions. This would be a significant impact.</p>		<p>final map approval.</p> <p>The City general plan shows Yosemite Avenue and Airport Way as six-lane facilities in the future. As part of the widening projects, this intersection would be improved. However, as mentioned previously, full funding for general plan roadway improvements has not been identified since the current PFIP covers only a portion of the cost. Acceptable operations can be provided at this intersection with the construction of the improvements listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ provide an additional through lane in the southbound approach; ▶ provide an additional through lane and a shared through-right lane in the northbound approach; and ▶ provide an exclusive right-turn lane on the eastbound approach. <p>A LOS analysis indicates that if the intersection is configured as described above, it will operate at LOS D or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Table 4.11-17 presents the intersection LOS results under Cumulative Plus Project with Mitigation Conditions. Note that a subsequent mitigation measure (4.11-4[p]) requires that Airport Way be widened to four lanes between Yosemite Avenue and Daniels Street to accommodate project trips at an acceptable LOS. By widening the roadway and providing additional through lanes at the intersection approaches, this intersection will operate at an acceptable LOS. The roadway widening therefore has a secondary benefit that provides acceptable operations at this intersection.</p> <p>Even though the improvements described above will provide acceptable operations under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, for purposes of CEQA, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable because full funding for the improvements has not been identified and implementation of the improvements prior to project buildout cannot be guaranteed.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-4(b): Pay Fair Share of Intersection Improvements at Airport Way/Wawona Street. To help implement these improvements, the project applicant shall make a fair-share contribution toward the unfunded portion of the intersection improvements. The fair-share percentage and the dollar</p>	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>amount of the fee/contribution will be determined at the time of final map approval.</p> <p>The General Plan shows Airport Way as six-lane facility in the future. As part of the Airport Way widening project, this intersection would be improved. However, as mentioned previously, full funding for General Plan roadway improvements has not been identified since the current PFIP covers only a portion of the cost. Acceptable operations can be provided at this intersection with the construction of the improvements listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ signalize intersection, ▶ provide a single left-turn lane and two through lanes on the southbound approach, and ▶ provide an additional through lane on the northbound approach. <p>A LOS analysis indicates that if the intersection is configured as described above, it will operate at LOS B during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Table 4.11-17 presents the intersection LOS results under Cumulative Plus Project with Mitigation Conditions. Even though the improvements described above will provide acceptable operations under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, for purposes of CEQA, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable because full funding for the improvements has not been identified and implementation of the improvements prior to project buildout cannot be guaranteed.</p> <p>Note that a subsequent mitigation measure requires that Airport Way be widened to four lanes between Yosemite Avenue and Daniels Street to accommodate project trips at an acceptable LOS. The mitigation measure at this intersection was designed to accommodate the roadway widening to four lanes. By providing the additional through lanes, this intersection will operate at an acceptable LOS. The roadway widening therefore has a secondary benefit that mitigates the impact at this intersection to a less-than-significant level.</p>	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-4(c): Pay Fair Share of Intersection Improvements at Airport Way/Daniels Street. To help implement these improvements, the project applicant shall make a fair-share contribution toward the unfunded portion of the intersection improvements. The fair-share percentage and the dollar amount of the fee/contribution will be determined at the time of final map approval.</p> <p>The General Plan shows Airport Way as a six-lane facility in the future. As part of the Airport Way widening project, this intersection would be improved. However, as mentioned previously, full funding for General Plan roadway improvements has not been identified since the current PFIP covers only a portion of the cost. Acceptable operations can be provided at this intersection with the construction of the improvements listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ provide an additional through lane, and add an overlap signal phase to the right-turn lane on the southbound approach; ▶ provide an additional left-turn lane, an additional through lane, and add an overlap signal phase to the right-turn lane on the northbound approach; ▶ add an overlap signal phase to the right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; and ▶ provide an additional left-turn lane on the westbound approach. <p>A LOS analysis indicates that if the intersection is configured as described above, it will operate at LOS D during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Table 4.11-17 presents the intersection LOS results under Cumulative Plus Project with Mitigation Conditions. As shown in Table 4.11-17, even with the mitigation described above, this intersection is close to operating at LOS E conditions during the p.m. peak hour. It is recommended that the City monitor this approach, and if traffic conditions warrant further improvements, the westbound through lane could be converted to a shared left/through lane. This improvement would also require that the intersection be operated under east-west “split” signal phasing, where the eastbound left and through traffic is given a green light, followed by the westbound left and through traffic.</p>	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Even though the improvements described above will provide acceptable operations under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, for purposes of CEQA, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable because full funding for the improvements has not been identified and implementation of the improvements prior to project buildout cannot be guaranteed.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-4(d): Pay Fair Share of Intersection Improvements at Airport Way/State Route 120 Westbound Ramps. To help implement these improvements, the project applicant shall make a fair-share contribution toward the unfunded portion of the intersection improvements. The fair-share percentage and the dollar amount of the fee/contribution will be determined at the time of final map approval.</p> <p>As described previously, the City of Manteca, in cooperation with Caltrans District 10 and SJCOG, has initiated a PSR for the State Route 120/Airport Way interchange. The interchange project will determine the required interchange design to serve full buildout of the City of Manteca General Plan (six lanes on Airport Way) and the planned widening of SR 120 from four to six lanes. Acceptable operations can be provided at this intersection with the construction of the improvements listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ construct three through lanes and a right-turn lane on the southbound approach; ▶ construct an additional left-turn lane and two additional through lanes on the northbound approach; and ▶ construct two left-turn lanes, a shared through/right-turn lane, and a right-turn lane on the westbound approach. <p>A LOS analysis indicates that if the intersection is configured as described above, it will operate at LOS C during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Table 4.11-17 presents the intersection LOS results under Cumulative Plus Project with Mitigation Conditions. While the improvements described above would provide acceptable operations at this intersection, the impact is still considered significant and unavoidable for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ full funding for the project has not been identified, 	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ the timeline for completion of the interchange improvements is unknown, and ▶ this project is outside the control of the City or the project applicant and its implementation cannot be guaranteed. <p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-4(e): Pay Fair Share of Intersection Improvements at Airport Way/State Route 120 Eastbound Ramps. To help implement these improvements, the project applicant shall make a fair-share contribution toward the unfunded portion of the intersection improvements. The fair-share percentage and the dollar amount of the fee/contribution will be determined at the time of final map approval.</p> <p>As described previously, the City of Manteca, in cooperation with Caltrans District 10, and SJCOG has initiated a PSR for the State Route 120/Airport Way interchange. The interchange project will determine the required interchange design to serve full buildout of the City of Manteca General Plan (six lanes on Airport Way) and the planned widening of SR 120 from four to six lanes. Acceptable operations can be provided at this intersection with the construction of the improvements listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ provide an additional left-turn lane and two additional through lanes on the southbound approach; ▶ provide three through lanes and a right-turn lane on the northbound approach; and ▶ provide one left-turn lane, a shared through/left-turn lane, and two right-turn lanes on the eastbound approach. <p>A LOS analysis indicates that if the intersection is configured as described above, it will operate at LOS C or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Table 4.11-17 presents the intersection LOS results under Cumulative Plus Project with Mitigation Conditions. While the improvements described above would provide acceptable operations at this intersection, the impact is still considered significant and unavoidable for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ full funding for the project has not been identified, ▶ the timeline for completion of the interchange improvements is unknown, and 	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>▶ this project is outside the control of the City or the project applicant and its implementation cannot be guaranteed.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-4(f): Pay Fair Share of Intersection Improvements at the Airport Way/Atherton Drive intersection. To help implement these improvements, the project applicant shall make a fair-share contribution toward the unfunded portion of the intersection improvements. The fair-share percentage and the dollar amount of the fee/contribution will be determined at the time of final map approval.</p> <p>The General Plan shows Airport Way as a six-lane facility and Atherton Road as a four-lane facility in the future. As part of the widening projects, this intersection would be improved and signalized. However, as mentioned previously, full funding for General Plan roadway improvements has not been identified since the current PFIP covers only a portion of the cost. To meet the City's LOS standard, the following intersection improvements are necessary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ signalize intersection, ▶ construct an additional left-turn lane and two through lanes on the southbound approach, ▶ construct an additional through lane and a shared through/right-turn lane on the northbound approach, and ▶ construct an additional left-turn lane on the eastbound approach. <p>A LOS analysis indicates that if the intersection is configured as described above, it will operate at LOS D or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Table 4.11-17 presents the intersection LOS results under Cumulative Plus Project with Mitigation Conditions. Even though the improvements described above will provide acceptable operations under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, for purposes of CEQA, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable because full funding for the improvements has not been identified and implementation of the improvements prior to project buildout cannot be guaranteed.</p>	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-4(g): Pay Fair Share of Intersection Improvements at the Airport Way/Woodward Avenue intersection. To help implement these improvements, the project applicant shall make a fair-share contribution toward the unfunded portion of the intersection improvements. The fair-share percentage and the dollar amount of the fee/contribution will be determined at the time of final map approval.</p> <p>The General Plan shows Airport Way as a six-lane facility and Woodward Avenue as a four-lane facility in the future. As part of the widening projects, this intersection would be improved and signalized. However, as mentioned previously, full funding for General Plan roadway improvements has not been identified since the current PFIP covers only a portion of the cost. To meet the City’s LOS standard the following intersection improvements are necessary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ signalize intersection; ▶ construct one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane on the southbound approach; ▶ construct one left-turn lane, one through lane, and a shared through/right-turn lane on the northbound approach; ▶ construct one left-turn lane, one shared left/through lane, and one shared through/right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; and ▶ construct one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one shared through/right-turn lane on the eastbound approach. <p>A LOS analysis indicates that if the intersection is configured as described above, it will operate at LOS D or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Table 4.11-17 presents the intersection LOS results under Cumulative Plus Project with Mitigation Conditions. Even though the improvements described above will provide acceptable operations under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, for purposes of CEQA, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable because full funding for the improvements has not been identified and implementation of the improvements prior to project buildout cannot be guaranteed.</p>	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-4(h): Pay Fair Share of Intersection Improvements at the Union Road/Yosemite Avenue Intersection. To help implement these improvements, the project applicant shall make a fair-share contribution toward the unfunded portion of the intersection improvements. The fair-share percentage and the dollar amount of the fee/contribution will be determined at the time of final map approval.</p> <p>The General Plan shows Yosemite Avenue and Union Road as six-lane facilities in the future. As part of the widening projects, this intersection would be improved. However, as mentioned previously, full funding for General Plan roadway improvements has not been identified since the current PFIP covers only a portion of the cost. To meet the City’s LOS standard the following intersection improvements are necessary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ construct a single left-turn lane and an additional through lane on the southbound approach, ▶ construct an additional through lane and an exclusive right-turn lane on the northbound approach, ▶ construct an additional left-turn lane and one through lane on the eastbound approach, and ▶ construct an additional through lane and an exclusive right-turn lane on the westbound approach. <p>A LOS analysis indicates that if the intersection is configured as described above, it will operate at LOS D or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Table 4.11-17 presents the intersection LOS results under Cumulative Plus Project with Mitigation Conditions. Even though the improvements described above will provide acceptable operations under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, for purposes of CEQA, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable because full funding for the improvements has not been identified and implementation of the improvements prior to project buildout cannot be guaranteed.</p> <p>Note that a subsequent mitigation measure requires that Airport Way be widened to four lanes between Yosemite Avenue and Daniels Street to accommodate project trips at an acceptable LOS. The mitigation measure at this intersection was designed to</p>	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>accommodate the roadway widening to four lanes. By providing the additional through lanes, this intersection will operate at an acceptable LOS. The roadway widening therefore has a secondary benefit that provides acceptable operations at this intersection.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-4(i): Retime Daniels Street/Fishback Road Traffic Signal to Improve Intersection Operations. The project applicant shall coordinate with the City and shall fully fund the retiming of the traffic signal at the Daniels Street/Fishback Road intersection (it is assumed that this signal is installed by the project applicant when the project opens). The retiming shall ensure that the operation of this intersection meets the City's operational standards. Implementation of this measure would improve operation of this intersection to LOS D.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-4(j): Pay Fair Share of Intersection Improvements at the Union Road/Wawona Street Intersection. To help implement these improvements, the project applicant shall make a fair-share contribution toward the unfunded portion of the intersection improvements. The fair-share percentage and the dollar amount of the fee/contribution will be determined at the time of final map approval.</p> <p>The General Plan shows Union Road as four-lane facility in the future. As part of the Union Road widening project, this intersection would be improved. However, the LOS analysis indicated that additional northbound and southbound through lanes are required to meet LOS thresholds. Moreover, as mentioned previously, full funding for General Plan roadway improvements has not been identified since the current PFIP covers only a portion of the cost. Acceptable operations can be provided at this intersection with the construction of the improvements listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ construct a shared through/right-turn lane on the southbound approach, ▶ construct an additional through lane on the northbound approach, and 	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ construct a through lane and an exclusive right-turn lane with overlapping phase on the westbound approach. <p>A LOS analysis indicates that if the intersection is configured as described above, it will operate at LOS D or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Table 4.11-17 presents the intersection LOS results under Cumulative Plus Project with Mitigation Conditions. Even though the improvements described above will provide acceptable operations under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, for purposes of CEQA, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable because full funding for the improvements has not been identified and implementation of the improvements prior to project buildout cannot be guaranteed. Additionally, the cost of acquiring the necessary right-of-way to widen the northbound and southbound approaches to this intersection may be prohibitive.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-4(k): Pay Fair Share of Intersection Improvements at the Union Road/Daniels Street intersection. To help implement these improvements, the project applicant shall make a fair-share contribution toward the unfunded portion of the intersection improvements. The fair-share percentage and the dollar amount of the fee/contribution will be determined at the time of final map approval.</p> <p>The General Plan shows Union Road as a four-lane facility in the future. As part of the Union Road widening project, this intersection would be improved. However, as mentioned previously, full funding for General Plan roadway improvements has not been identified since the current PFIP covers only a portion of the cost. Acceptable operations can be provided at this intersection with the construction of the improvements listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ signalize the intersection, ▶ construct two additional through lanes on the southbound approach, ▶ construct a single left-turn lane and a right-turn lane on the eastbound approach, and 	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ construct a single left-turn lane and three through lanes on the northbound approach. <p>A LOS analysis indicates that if the intersection is configured as described above, it will operate at LOS D or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Table 4.11-17 presents the intersection LOS results under Cumulative Plus Project with Mitigation Conditions. Even though the improvements described above will provide acceptable operations under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, for purposes of CEQA, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable because full funding for the improvements has not been identified and implementation of the improvements prior to project buildout cannot be guaranteed.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-4(1): Pay Fair Share of Intersection Improvements at the Union Road/State Route 120 Westbound Ramps. To help implement these improvements, the project applicant shall make a fair-share contribution toward the unfunded portion of the intersection improvements. The fair-share percentage and the dollar amount of the fee/contribution will be determined at the time of final map approval.</p> <p>As described previously, the City of Manteca, in cooperation with Caltrans District 10 and SJCOG, has initiated a combined PSR/EIR for the State Route 120/Union Road interchange. The interchange project will determine the required interchange design to serve full buildout of the City of Manteca General Plan (four lanes on Union Road) and the planned widening of SR 120 from four to six lanes. Acceptable operations can be provided at this intersection with the construction of the improvements listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ construct an additional left-turn lane and through lane on the northbound approach, ▶ construct two through lanes and an exclusive right-turn lane on the southbound approach, and ▶ construct an additional left-turn lane and a right-turn lane on the westbound approach. <p>A LOS analysis indicates that if the intersection is configured as described above, it will operate at LOS B or better during the a.m.</p>	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>and p.m. peak hours. Table 4.11-17 presents the intersection LOS results under Cumulative Plus Project with Mitigation Conditions. While the improvements described above would provide acceptable operations at this intersection, the impact is still considered significant and unavoidable for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ full funding for the project has not been identified, ▶ the timeline for completion of the interchange improvements is unknown, and ▶ this project is outside the control of the City or the project applicant and its implementation cannot be guaranteed. <p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-4(m): Pay Fair Share of Intersection Improvements at the Union Road/State Route 120 Eastbound Ramps. To help implement these improvements, the project applicant shall make a fair-share contribution toward the unfunded portion of the intersection improvements. The fair-share percentage and the dollar amount of the fee/contribution will be determined at the time of final map approval.</p> <p>As described previously, the City of Manteca, in cooperation with Caltrans District 10 and SJCOG, has initiated a combined PSR/EIR for the State Route 120/Union Road interchange. The interchange project will determine the required interchange design to serve full buildout of the City of Manteca General Plan (four lanes on Union Road) and the planned widening of SR 120 from four to six lanes. Acceptable operations can be provided at this intersection with the construction of the improvements listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ construct an additional through lane on the southbound approach; ▶ construct three through lanes and a right-turn lane on the northbound approach; and ▶ construct one left-turn lane, a shared left/through lane, and two right-turn lanes on the eastbound approach. <p>A LOS analysis indicates that if the intersection is configured as described above, it will operate at LOS C or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Table 4.11-17 presents the intersection LOS results under Cumulative Plus Project with Mitigation Conditions.</p>	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>While the improvements described above would provide acceptable operations at this intersection, the impact is still considered significant and unavoidable for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ full funding for the project has not been identified, ▶ the timeline for completion of the interchange improvements is unknown, and ▶ this project is outside the control of the City or the project applicant and its implementation cannot be guaranteed. <p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-4(n): Pay Fair Share of Intersection Improvements at the Union Road/Atherton Drive intersection. To help implement these improvements, the project applicant shall make a fair-share contribution toward the unfunded portion of the intersection improvements. The fair-share percentage and the dollar amount of the fee/contribution will be determined at the time of final map approval.</p> <p>The General Plan shows Union Road as a six-lane facility and Atherton Road as a four-lane facility in the future. As part of the widening projects, this intersection would be improved and signalized. However, as mentioned previously, full funding for General Plan roadway improvements has not been identified since the current PFIP covers only a portion of the cost. To meet the City's LOS standard, the following intersection improvements are necessary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ signalize intersection; ▶ construct two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and a shared through/right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; ▶ construct two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and a shared through/right-turn lane on the northbound approach; ▶ construct a left-turn lane, two through lanes, and a right-turn lane on the westbound approach; and ▶ construct two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and a right-turn lane on the southbound approach. <p>A LOS analysis indicates that if the intersection is configured as described above, it will operate at LOS D or better during the a.m.</p>	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>and p.m. peak hours. Table 4.11-17 presents the intersection LOS results under Cumulative Plus Project with Mitigation Conditions. Even though the improvements described above will provide acceptable operations under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, for purposes of CEQA, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable because full funding for the improvements has not been identified and implementation of the improvements prior to project buildout cannot be guaranteed.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-4(o): Pay Fair Share of Intersection Improvements at the Union Road/Woodward Avenue intersection. To help implement these improvements, the project applicant shall make a fair-share contribution toward the unfunded portion of the intersection improvements. The fair-share percentage and the dollar amount of the fee/contribution will be determined at the time of final map approval.</p> <p>The General Plan shows Union Road and Woodward Avenue as four-lane facilities in the future. As part of the widening projects, this intersection would be improved and signalized. However, as mentioned previously, full funding for General Plan roadway improvements has not been identified since the current PFIP covers only a portion of the cost. To meet the City’s LOS standard the following intersection improvements are necessary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ signalize intersection and ▶ construct one left-turn lane and one shared through/right-turn lane on all approaches. <p>A LOS analysis indicates that if the intersection is configured as described above, it will operate at LOS D or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Table 4.11-17 presents the intersection LOS results under Cumulative Plus Project with Mitigation Conditions. Even though the improvements described above will provide acceptable operations under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, for purposes of CEQA, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable because full funding for the improvements has not been identified and implementation of the improvements prior to project buildout cannot be guaranteed.</p>	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-4(p): Pay Fair Share to Widen Airport Way and Union Road. To help implement these improvements, the project applicant shall make a fair-share contribution toward the unfunded portion of the intersection improvements. The fair-share percentage and the dollar amount of the fee/contribution will be determined at the time of final map approval.</p> <p>The widening of Airport Way and Union Road has been identified as needed by the City of Manteca’s General Plan. The project applicant shall pay its fair share of the cost of widening Airport Way and Union Road, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Airport Way between Daniels Street and Yosemite Avenue, widen from 2 to 4 lanes; ▶ Airport Way between Daniels Street and Atherton Drive, widen from 2 to 6 lanes; ▶ Union Road between SR 120 and Yosemite Avenue, widen from 2 to 4 lanes, except near Wawona Street (see below); and ▶ Union Road between SR 120 and Atherton Drive, widen from 2 to 6 lanes; <p>Table 4.11-18 shows that adequate roadway segment operations can be provided by widening Airport Way and Union Road. Although the ADT projection requires Union Road widening from two to four lanes, the intersection operations at the Union Road/Wawona Street intersection would require three through lanes in each direction on Union Road to operate acceptably (the additional through lanes could be dropped no less than 300 feet downstream of the intersection to provide adequate lane utilization).</p> <p>Based on a site visit to this intersection, there is not adequate right-of-way to accommodate three northbound and southbound through lanes (particularly north of the Wawona Street). Since Union Road is currently two lanes south of Wawona Street, additional improvements are required to build out the circulation element shown in the General Plan. Therefore, it is recommended that right-of-way be reserved on Union Road south of Wawona Street to provide the mitigated lane configurations identified in Mitigation Measure 4.11-4(j).</p>	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>The improvements described above will provide acceptable operations under Cumulative Plus Project conditions; however, for purposes of CEQA, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable because full funding for the improvements has not been identified and implementation of the improvements prior to project buildout cannot be guaranteed.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-4(q): Pay SJCOG Regional Transportation Impact Fee. To mitigate project impacts on SR 120, the project applicant shall pay the SJCOG Regional Transportation Impact Fee when building permits are issued. As shown in Table 4.11-19, the widening of SR 120 from four to six lanes (three in each direction) would provide LOS C conditions in the off-peak directions for the freeway segments identified above. However, even with the additional lanes on SR 120, the peak directions of travel (westbound in the a.m. peak hour, eastbound in the p.m. peak hour) will continue to operate at LOS F conditions and additional widening improvements (e.g., eight lanes) are not planned. Because the widening improvement is outside the control of the City or the project applicant and the improvements would not provide acceptable operations on the freeway mainline, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-4(r): Pay Fair Share for Interchange Improvements at Union Road and Airport Way on State Route 120. As mentioned previously, the City of Manteca, in cooperation with Caltrans District 10 and SJCOG has initiated a PSR for the SR 120/Airport Way interchange and a combined PSR/EIR for the SR 120/Union Road interchange. The interchange project will determine the required design to serve full buildout of the City of Manteca General Plan and the planned widening of SR 120 from four to six lanes. The on-ramp and off-ramp designs will provide the necessary acceleration, deceleration, and storage lengths to serve projected morning and evening peak hour volumes at acceptable levels of service. To reduce the impact of project trips, the project applicant shall pay its fair share for interchange</p>	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>improvements. The fair-share percentage and the dollar amount of the fee/contribution will be determined at the time of final map approval.</p> <p>As shown in Table 4.11-20, the LOS results with the interchange improvements in place indicate that the following ramp junctions are expected to operate at an acceptable LOS during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours under Cumulative Plus Project Conditions except the following ramp junctions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The LOS analysis indicates that the following ramp junctions will operate at LOS F conditions during the a.m. or p.m. peak hour because of congestion on the freeway mainline: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Westbound SR 120 on-ramp from Union Road is expected to operate at LOS E during the a.m. peak hour and ▶ Westbound SR 120 on-ramp from Airport Way is expected to operate at LOS F during the a.m. peak hour. <p>Since the interchange improvements do not mitigate the impact of the project, the interchange improvements are not under the control of the City or applicant, and no funding sources have been identified for the interchange improvements, this remains a significant and unavoidable impact.</p> <p>Because it cannot be guaranteed at this time that recommended fair-share improvements to the Airport Way intersections with Yosemite Avenue, Wawona Street, Daniels Street, Woodward Avenue, and Atherton Drive; Union Road intersections with Wawona Street, Daniels Street, Yosemite Avenue, Atherton Drive, and Woodward Avenue; SR 120 westbound ramps at Union Road and Airport Way; SR 120 eastbound ramps at Union Road and Airport Way; the widening of Airport Way and Union Road; SR 120 widening; and SR 120 interchange improvements at Union Road and Airport Way (Impact 4.11-4) would be implemented prior to buildout of the project, for purposes of CEQA, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.11-5 Transportation and Circulation—Increased Roadway Congestion from Construction Traffic. It is estimated that 80 one-way daily trips to the project site would be generated during peak construction periods. This could result in adverse effects on the operation of project area roadways during the peak commute periods. In addition, construction traffic, particularly truck traffic, could degrade pavement conditions along access roadways. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-5: Prepare and Implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall prepare a Construction Management Plan and submit the plan to the City of Manteca Public Works Department for review and approval. The Construction Management Plan shall identify the timing of construction and the timing of elements that would result in the full or partial blockage of local roadways. The plan shall specify the measures that would be implemented to minimize traffic-related impacts, including construction parking during construction, which shall be limited to on-site areas or facilities designated for parking uses (e.g., parking lots). These measures could include, but are not limited to the following: use of signage notifying travelers that they are entering a construction zone; and use of cones, flaggers, and guide-vehicles to direct traffic through the construction zone. In addition, the plan shall include, at a minimum, the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Local roadways shall be jointly monitored by the City and project applicant every six months to determine whether project-related construction traffic is degrading roadway conditions. Roadways with potential to be damaged by construction traffic and included in the monitoring effort shall be agreed to by the City and the project applicant. ▶ All degradation of pavement conditions because of project-related construction traffic shall be fully repaired by the project applicant to the satisfaction of the City of Manteca, based on maintaining at least preconstruction conditions. ▶ Procedures shall be provided for any road closures and movement of large construction vehicles such as cranes and dump trucks. ▶ Plans shall be provided for lane closures, including times (e.g., limit closures to between 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m.). <p>A copy of the plan shall be submitted to local emergency response agencies and these agencies shall be notified at least 14 days before the commencement of construction that would partially or fully obstruct local roadways.</p>	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.11-6 Transportation and Circulation—Impacts on Emergency Vehicle Access. The project would provide adequate emergency access to the project site. However, construction vehicles could temporarily obstruct local roadways, which could impair the ability of local emergency response agencies to respond to an emergency in the project area. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-6: Coordinate with Appropriate Agencies Regarding Emergency Vehicle Access. The project applicant shall coordinate with appropriate agencies (e.g., police and fire departments) to ensure that the site plan has adequate emergency vehicle access.</p>	LTS
<p>4.11-7 Transportation and Circulation—Conformity with City Parking Requirements. The project would provide off-street parking consistent with the City’s parking ordinance. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<p>4.11-8 Transportation and Circulation—Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation Impacts. The project's proposed network of pedestrian sidewalks, internal circulation and bicycle facilities would conform to the City's General Plan policies requiring connectivity between retail shopping, residences, and employment center. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<p>4.11-9 Transportation and Circulation—Bus Transit Services. Implementation of the project would generate a need for public bus transportation services. Because limited bus services are currently available to serve the project area and none are proposed as part of the project, this impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-9: Coordinate with the City to Ensure the Provision of Bus Transportation Services. The project applicant shall coordinate with the City and modify project designs to provide appropriate bus transit facilities at the project site. These facilities shall be designed to meet Americans with Disabilities Act design standards and provide adequate width, vehicle and pedestrian circulation, turning radius of streets, driveways, and parking lots. These facilities could include, but are not limited to, one or more sheltered transit stops along the project frontage on either Atherton Road or within the project site.</p> <p>While the above measures would ensure that adequate transit facilities at the project site, it cannot be guaranteed that the City would be able to extend bus transit routes to the project site at the time the project begins operation. If bus transit services are provided to the site at the time of issuance of the first occupancy permit, then this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. However, because it cannot be guaranteed that adequate</p>	SU

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		transit services would be in place prior to the opening of the project, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable .	
4.12 Cultural Resources			
4.12-1 Cultural Resources — Known Archaeological Resources. Archival and field research has demonstrated that there are no known archaeological resources within the proposed project area. Because there are no known recorded archeological sites, features, or artifacts within the project area, the project’s impact to known archeological resources would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.12-2 Cultural Resources — Known Historical Resources. Archival and field research has demonstrated that there are no known historical resources within the proposed project area. Because there are no known historical resources within the project area, the project’s impact to historical resources would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.12-3 Cultural Resources — Undiscovered/Unrecorded Archaeological Sites. Project-related construction activities may uncover or otherwise disturb previously undiscovered or unrecorded archaeological resources. If such resources were to represent “historical resources” or “unique archaeological resources” as defined by CEQA, any substantial change to or destruction of these resources would be a potentially significant impact.	PS	Mitigation Measure 4.12-3: Undiscovered/Unrecorded Archaeological Sites. Prior to the onset of project-related ground disturbing activities (e.g., land clearing), all construction personnel shall be alerted to the possibility of uncovering buried cultural resources and shall be educated by a qualified archaeologist as to identification of archaeological artifacts. If artifacts or unusual amounts of stone, bone, or shell or significant quantities of historic-era artifacts such as glass, ceramic, metal, building remains, etc. are uncovered during construction activities, work in the vicinity of the specific construction site at which the suspected resources have been uncovered shall be suspended, and the project applicant shall be immediately contacted. At that time, the project applicant shall retain a qualified professional archaeologist, who shall conduct a field investigation of the specific site and recommend measures deemed necessary for the protection or recovery of any cultural resources concluded by the archaeologist to represent significant or potentially significant resources as defined by CEQA. These measures could include, but would not necessarily be limited to,	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		avoidance, archival research, subsurface testing, and contiguous block unit excavation. The project applicant shall implement the measures deemed necessary by the archaeologist before the resumption of construction activities within the area of the find.	
4.12-4 Cultural Resources — Undiscovered/Unrecorded Human Remains. Project-related construction activities could uncover or otherwise disturb previously undiscovered or unrecorded human remains. Any disturbance of human remains would be a potentially significant impact.	PS	Mitigation Measure 4.12-4: Undiscovered/Unrecorded Human Remains. In accordance with the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities, the contractor and/or the project applicant shall immediately halt potentially damaging excavation in the area of the burial and notify the county coroner and a professional archaeologist to determine the nature of the remains. The coroner is required to examine all discoveries of human remains within 48 hours of receiving notice of a discovery on private or state lands (Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5[b]). If the coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American, he or she must contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) by phone within 24 hours of making that determination (Health and Safety Code Section 7050[c]). Following the coroner’s findings, the property owner, contractor or project applicant, an archaeologist, and the NAHC-designated Most Likely Descendent (MLD) shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of the remains and take appropriate steps to ensure that additional human interments are not disturbed. The responsibilities for acting upon notification of a discovery of Native American human remains are identified in California Public Resources Code Section (PRC) 5097.9. Upon the discovery of Native American remains, the landowner shall ensure that the immediate vicinity (according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards and practices) is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until consultation with the MLD has taken place. The MLD shall have 48 hours to complete a site inspection and make recommendations after being granted access to the site. A range of possible treatments for the remains, including nondestructive removal and analysis, preservation in place, relinquishment of the remains and associated items to the descendants, or other culturally appropriate treatment, may be discussed. PRC 5097.9 suggests that the concerned parties	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>may extend discussions beyond the initial 48 hours to allow for the discovery of additional remains. The following is a list of site protection measures that the landowner shall employ:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Record the site with the NAHC or the appropriate Information Center. (2) Utilize an open-space or conservation zoning designation or easement. (3) Record a document with the county in which the property is located. <p>The landowner or their authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance if the NAHC is unable to identify a MLD or the MLD fails to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being granted access to the site. The landowner or their authorized representative may also re-inter the remains in a location not subject to further disturbance if they reject the recommendation of the MLD, and mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner. These procedures and other provisions of the California Health and Safety Code will reduce potential impacts to human remains to a less-than-significant level.</p>	

LTS = Less Than Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable